1 BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF ST. JOHN'S HOSPITAL, Appellant, PCHB No. 226 5 VS. FINDINGS OF FACT, 6 CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER SOUTHWEST AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY, 8 Respondent. 9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

15

This matter, the appeal of a fifty dollar civil penalty for an alleged smoke emission violation of respondent's Regulation I, came before the Pollution Control Hearings Board (Walt Woodward, hearing officer) as a formal hearing in the Longview Library, Longview, at 12:30 p.m., December 21, 1972.

. Appellant was represented by Michael Ivanick and Wayne M. Vaughan, its chief engineer and maintenance engineer, respectively. Respondent appeared through its counsel, James D. Ladley. Thomas E. Archer, Kelso court reporter, recorded the proceedings.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were offered and admitted.

On the basis of testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Pollution Control Hearings Board prepared Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Order which were submitted to the appellant and respondent on February 14, 1973. No objections or exceptions to the Proposed Findings, Conclusions and Order having been received, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes and enters the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

Shortly after noon on October 31, 1972 from the boiler stack of St. John's Hospital, 15th and East Kessler Boulevard, Longview, Cowlit County, smoke of opacity denser than No. 3 on the Ringelmann scale was emitted for more than three minutes.

II.

The emission occurred during a necessary and temporary change over III.

As the result of a similar incident on October 2, 1970, respondent had informed appellant that respondent should be notified by appellant of unavoidable upset conditions. Appellant accepted this request, attempted to comply with it, but did not have the same understanding as respondent of what constituted an "upset condition."

IV.

On October 31, 1972, an employee of appellant made at least four outdoor visual inspections of the hospital boiler stack during the peri.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

from noon to 12:15 p.m., saw two different black smoke emissions, adjusted the firing of the boiler to control the emissions and, not regarding the emissions as an "upset condition," made no attempt to contact respondent regarding the emissions. Subsequently, appellant adopted a policy of notifying respondent of "change over" smoke emissions.

v.

Section 4.02 of respondent's Regulation I makes it unlawful to permit the emission for more than three minutes in any hour of smoke darker in density than No. 2 on the Ringelmann scale. Section 4.07(1) of respondent's Regulation I provides for waiver of violation if the incident is caused by "unavoidable upset conditions" which are reported to the Southwest Air Pollution Control Authority "as soon as possible."

VI.

Respondent served appellant with a formal Notice of Violation of Section 4.02 of respondent's Regulation I and assessed a fifty dollar civil penalty in connection therewith. The penalty is the subject of this appeal.

From these Findings, the Pollution Control Hearings Board comes to these

CONCLUSIONS

I.

Appellant was in violation of Section 4.02 of respondent's Regulation I on October 31, 1972.

II.

The fifty dollar civil penalty, while reasonable because of respondent's prior warning on the necessity for notification of respondent

FINDINGS OF FACT,

CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

of unavoidable upset conditions, appears to be questionable in view of 1 appellant's misunderstanding of what constituted an upset condition. 2 necessity for collection of the penalty is diminished further by 3 appellant's subsequent and continuing efforts to give respondent prompt notice of unavoidable smoke emissions. 5 Therefore, the Pollution Control Hearings Board issues this 6 ORDER 7 The violation of Section 4.02 of respondent's Regulation I is 8 affirmed, but the instant civil penalty of fifty dollars is suspended 9 pending no subsequent violations which can be attributed to a failure 10 by appellant to comply with Section 4.07(1) of respondent's Regulation I. 11 DONE at Olympia, Washington this 31d day of april 12 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 13 14 15 16 17 W. A. GISSBERG, Member 18 19 20 21Mr. Gissberg, not having participated in this case, did not sign 22 the Order. 23 24

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

25

26